

University of Michigan Law School

## University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

---

Articles

Faculty Scholarship

---

1906

### Liability of Water Companies for Fire Losses

Edson R. Sunderland

*University of Michigan Law School*

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles/1319>

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles>



Part of the [Business Organizations Law Commons](#), [Energy and Utilities Law Commons](#), [State and Local Government Law Commons](#), and the [Torts Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Sunderland, Edson R. "Liability of Water Companies for Fire Losses." Mich. L. Rev. 4 (1906): 540-1.

This Response or Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

LIABILITY OF WATER COMPANIES FOR FIRE LOSSES.—In two recent articles published in this Review, the question of the liability of water companies for fire losses was somewhat exhaustively discussed. The majority of the actions wherein it has been sought to hold water companies liable for fire losses suffered by private property owners, have been brought for breach of contract. In a few cases the theory adopted was that the water company owed a duty to all property owners, by reason of the public character of its service; and the fact that it was under contract with the city to furnish an adequate water supply and pressure for fire protection, did not relieve it from liability in tort for any loss suffered by an inhabitant of the city through insufficient service. The Supreme Courts of Indiana, in *Fitch v. Seymour Water Co.*, 139 Ind. 214, Georgia, in *Fowler v. Athens City Water Works Co.*, 83 Ga. 219, and Mississippi, in *Wilkinson v. Light, Heat and Water Co.*, 78 Miss. 389, have repudiated this doctrine of liability in tort, though the Supreme Court of North Carolina, a most able and progressive court, has affirmed it, in *Fisher v. Greensboro Water Supply Co.*, 128 N. C. 375.

In a somewhat curious way, which it is not material to discuss here, the question of the validity of the judgment in the *Fisher case* got into the federal courts, and the United States Circuit Court, in *Guardian Trust & Deposit Co. v. Fisher*, 115 Fed. 184, made an independent examination of the grounds for the North Carolina judgment, holding that an action in tort would lie. This case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that tribunal has sustained the Circuit Court. *Guardian Trust & Deposit Co. v. Fisher*, 26 Sup. Ct. Rep. 186.

MR. JUSTICE BREWER, rendering the opinion of the court, said: "We are met with the contention that, independently of contract, there is no duty on the part of the water company to furnish an adequate supply of water; that the city owes no such duty to the citizen, and that contracting with a company to supply water imposes upon the company no higher duty than the city itself owed, and confers upon the citizen no greater right against the company than it had against the city; that the matter is solely one of contract between the city and the company, for any breach of which the only right of action is one *ex contractu* on the part of the city. It is true that a company, contracting with a city to construct water works and supply water may fail to commence performance. Its contractual obligations are then with the city only, which may recover damages, but merely for breach of contract. There would be no tort, no negligence, in the total failure of the company. It may also be true that no citizen is a party to such a contract, and has no contractual or other right to recover for the failure of the company to act; but, if the company proceeds under its contract, constructs and operates its plant, it enters upon a public calling. It occupies the streets of the city, acquires rights and privileges peculiar to itself. It invites the cit-

izens, and if they avail themselves of its conveniences, and omit making other and personal arrangements for a supply of water, then the company owes a duty to them in the discharge of its public calling, and a neglect by it in the discharge of the obligations imposed by its charter, or by contract with the city, may be regarded as a breach of absolute duty, and recovery may be had for such neglect. The action, however, is not one for breach of contract, but for negligence in the discharge of such duty to the public, and is an action for a tort."

This decision is an important and far-reaching one, and may mark the beginning of a general movement among the courts to recognize the tort liability of water companies for fire losses due to insufficient water supply.

E. R. S.